

NOTE

Another Deformation of Weyl's Denominator Formula

Todd Simpson

*Department of Mathematics, Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802*

Communicated by the Managing Editors

Received January 24, 1995

View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

Our purpose is to prove an identity much like Okada's [O] deformations of Weyl's denominator formula. This identity will specialize to Weyl's formula for root systems of type B . The reader should consult [O] as needed for definitions and notations.

Given a positive integer n , we denote by $\langle n \rangle$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. A sequence (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) of 1's, 0's, and -1 's is said to be sign-alternating if each partial sum $s_1 + \dots + s_r$, $r \in \langle k \rangle$, is either 0 or 1. For example, the rows and columns of an alternating sign matrix are sign-alternating sequences with sum 1. Let \mathcal{B}'_n be the set of $(2n+1) \times 2n$ matrices $A = [a_{ij}]$ such that:

A is invariant under 180° rotation; i.e., $a_{ij} = a_{2n+2-i, 2n+1-j}$ for all appropriate i and j .

Each column of A is sign-alternating with sum 1.

Each row of A , except the $(n+1)$ th, is sign-alternating with sum 1.

The sequence $(a_{n+1,1}, \dots, a_{n+1,n})$ is sign-alternating with sum 0.

We remark that a matrix A is in \mathcal{B}'_n if and only if its transpose tA is in the set \mathcal{C}'_n that appears in Theorem 4.4 of [O].

Let $L = L(n) = \{(i, j; k, l): 1 \leq i < k \leq 2n+1, 2n \geq j > l \geq 1\}$ and define $i(A) = \sum_{(i, j; k, l) \in L} a_{ij} a_{kl}$ for $A \in \mathcal{B}'_n$. Define the following subsets of L :

$$L_0 = \{(i, j; k, l) \in L : i = n + 1 \text{ or } k = n + 1\},$$

$$L_1 = \{(i, j; k, l) \in L : i + k = 2n + 2, j + l = 2n + 1\},$$

$$L_2 = L \setminus (L_0 \cup L_1),$$

$$L_+ = \{(i, j; k, l) \in L : k \leq n\},$$

$$L_{\pm} = \{(i, j; k, l) \in L : i \leq n, k \geq n + 2\}.$$

For $* \in \{0, 1, 2, +, \pm\}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}'_n$, put $i_*(A) = \sum_{(i, j; k, l) \in L_*} a_{ij} a_{kl}$. Define $i_1^+(A) = \#\{(i, j) : i \leq n, j \geq n + 1, a_{ij} = 1\}$ and $i_1^-(A) = \#\{(i, j) : i \leq n, j \geq n + 1, a_{ij} = -1\}$. Let $s(A)$ denote the number of -1 's in A .

For each $i \in \langle n \rangle$, let ε_i be the vector (written as a $2n \times 1$ matrix) with a 1 as its i th component, a -1 as its $(2n + 1 - i)$ th component, and 0's elsewhere. Given $\alpha = \sum_i \alpha_i \varepsilon_i$, we write $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$, where x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are commuting indeterminates.

Finally, let

$$\delta'(B_n) = (n - \tfrac{1}{2}, \dots, \tfrac{3}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, 0, -\tfrac{1}{2}, -\tfrac{3}{2}, \dots, -n + \tfrac{1}{2})$$

and

$$\delta(B_n) = (n - \tfrac{1}{2}, \dots, \tfrac{3}{2}, \tfrac{1}{2}, -\tfrac{1}{2}, -\tfrac{3}{2}, \dots, -n + \tfrac{1}{2}),$$

these vectors being written as $(2n + 1) \times 1$ and $2n \times 1$ matrices, respectively. We can now state our deformation of Weyl's formula.

THEOREM 1. *For $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + tx_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + tx_i x_j)(1 + tx_i x_j^{-1}) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{B}'_n} b_A(t) x^{\delta'(B_n) - A \delta(B_n)},$$

where $b_A(t) = t^{i_1^+(A) + (i_0(A) + i_2(A))/2} (1 + 1/t)^{s(A)/2}$.

When $t = -1$, Theorem 1 gives us Weyl's formula for the root system B_n . In this case, the only matrices A to appear in the sum are those with $s(A) = 0$. Such matrices have only 0's in their $(n + 1)$ th rows; crossing out these rows, we obtain a set of $2n \times 2n$ matrices. These form the Weyl group of $B_n = \{\pm \varepsilon_i, 1 \leq i \leq n; \pm \varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j, 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$.

MONOTONE TRIANGLES, PARTITIONS, AND \mathcal{B}'_n

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be a partition, with $n \geq \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0$. Let $\delta_n = (n, \dots, 2, 1)$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)$ the set of monotone triangles

$$T = \begin{matrix} & t_{11} \\ t_{21} & t_{22} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ t_{n1} & t_{n2} & \cdots & t_{nn} \end{matrix}, \quad t_{ij} \leq t_{i-1, j} \leq t_{i, j+1}, \quad t_{ij} < t_{i, j+1},$$

whose n th rows contain $\lambda_n + 1, \lambda_{n-1} + 2, \dots, \lambda_1 + n$.

For any matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$, let $\hat{A} = [\hat{a}_{ij}]$ be the "column sum matrix" of A : $\hat{a}_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^i a_{kj}$. The correspondence $A \mapsto \hat{A}$ is a bijection on matrices of any particular size. Now given $T \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)$, let $A = A(T)$ be the $(2n+1) \times 2n$ matrix $[a_{ij}]$ with the following properties:

$$\text{For each } i \in \langle n \rangle, \hat{a}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = t_{il} \text{ for some } l; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{For } n+2 \leq i \leq 2n+1, a_{ij} = a_{2n+2-i, 2n+1-j}.$$

$$\text{For } j \in \langle 2n \rangle, a_{n+1, j} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^n a_{i, 2n+1-j} = a_{n+1, 2n+1-j}.$$

Clearly A is invariant under 180° rotation. It is also easy to see that all columns of A are sign-alternating with sum 1, as are all rows of A other than the $(n+1)$ th row. Meanwhile, the sequence $(a_{n+1, 1}, \dots, a_{n+1, n})$ is made up of 1's, 0's, and -1 's, and its sum is 0.

Let $P_{-1, 0}(n)$ denote the set of partitions λ whose Frobenius representations $(\alpha | \beta)$ satisfy

$$n-1 \geq \beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_{p(\lambda)} \geq \alpha_{p(\lambda)}.$$

Then we have:

LEMMA 2. *Let λ be a partition of at most n parts, each of which is no larger than n . Let $T \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)$ and let $A = A(T)$. Then the sequence $(a_{n+1, 1}, \dots, a_{n+1, n})$ is sign-alternating if and only if $\lambda \in P_{-1, 0}(n)$.*

Proof. Observe that the sequence $(\hat{a}_{n1}, \dots, \hat{a}_{n, 2n})$ depends only upon λ . For $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ and $r \in \langle n \rangle$, define $\#_{ij}(r)$ to be the number of $k \in \langle r \rangle$ such that $\hat{a}_{nk} = i$ and $\hat{a}_{n, 2n+1-k} = j$. We have:

$$\#_{00}(r) + \#_{01}(r) + \#_{10}(r) + \#_{11}(r) = r;$$

$$\#_{00}(r) \text{ is the number of 1's in the set } \{a_{n+1, 1}, \dots, a_{n+1, r}\};$$

$$\#_{11}(r) \text{ is the number of } -1\text{'s in the set } \{a_{n+1, 1}, \dots, a_{n+1, r}\}.$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=1}^r a_{n+1,k} &= \#_{00}(r) - \#_{11}(r) \\
 &= (\#_{00}(r) + \#_{01}(r)) - (\#_{01}(r) + \#_{11}(r)) \\
 &= \# \{k \in \langle r \rangle : \hat{a}_{nk} = 0\} - \# \{k \in \langle r \rangle : \hat{a}_{n, 2n+1-k} = 1\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We now recall a simple, but useful, lemma, due to Macdonald.

LEMMA 3 [M, Chap. I, (1.7)]. *Let λ be a partition with at most n parts, each of which is no larger than m . Then the sets $\{\lambda_i + n - i + 1 : i \in \langle n \rangle\}$ and $\{n + j - \lambda'_j : j \in \langle m \rangle\}$ are disjoint, and their union is $\langle n + m \rangle$.*

Let $(\alpha | \beta)$ be the Frobenius representation of λ . Lemma 3 implies that $\hat{a}_{nk} = 0$ if and only if $2n + 1 - k = \lambda'_j + n - j + 1$ for some $j \in \langle n \rangle$. If $k \leq r$, then $\lambda'_j - j = n - k \geq n - r \geq 0$, so $\lambda'_j - j = \beta_j$. So $\#_{00}(r) + \#_{01}(r)$ is the number of j such that $\beta_j \geq n - r$, equivalently the largest j such that $\beta_j \geq n - r$. Similarly, $\hat{a}_{n, 2n+1-k} = 1$ if and only if $2n + 1 - k = \lambda_i + n - i + 1$ for some $i \in \langle n \rangle$, and we see that $\#_{01}(r) + \#_{11}(r)$ is the largest i such that $\alpha_i \geq n - r$.

The preceding remarks imply that $\#_{00}(r) - \#_{11}(r) \geq 0$ for all $r \in \langle n \rangle$ if and only if $\beta_j \geq \alpha_j$ for all $j \leq p(\lambda)$, and that $\#_{00}(r) - \#_{11}(r) \leq 1$ for all $r \in \langle n \rangle$ if and only if $\alpha_i \geq \beta_{i+1}$ for all $i \leq p(\lambda) - 1$. Thus the sequence $(a_{n+1,1}, \dots, a_{n+1,n})$ is sign-alternating if and only if $\beta_1 \geq \alpha_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_{p(\lambda)} \geq \alpha_{p(\lambda)}$, and this completes the proof of Lemma 2.

As a corollary of Lemma 2, we see that $T \mapsto A(T)$ defines a bijection of $\bigcup_{\lambda} \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)$, $\lambda \in P_{-1,0}(n)$, onto \mathcal{B}'_n .

Recall the functions $i(A)$ and $i_*(A)$, $*$ in $\{0, 1, 2, +, \pm\}$, defined on matrices $A \in \mathcal{B}'_n$. It is easy to see that $i(A) = i_0(A) + i_1(A) + i_2(A)$, $i_1(A) + i_2(A) = 2i_+(A) + i_{\pm}(A)$, and $i_1(A) = i_1^+(A) + i_1^-(A)$ for any $A \in \mathcal{B}'_n$.

If T is any monotone triangle, then we define

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max(T) &= \# \{(i, j) : t_{ij} < t_{i-1, j} = t_{i, j+1}\}; \\
 \text{sp}(T) &= \# \{(i, j) : t_{ij} < t_{i-1, j} < t_{i, j+1}\}; \\
 x^T &= x_1^{s_1} x_2^{s_2 - s_1} \dots x_n^{s_n - s_{n-1}}, \quad \text{where} \quad s_i = \sum_{l=1}^i t_{il}.
 \end{aligned}$$

And if λ is any partition, we put

$$\begin{aligned}
 t(\lambda) &= \# \{(i, j) : i \leq j, \lambda_i + \lambda_{j+1} > i + j\}; \\
 v(\lambda) &= \# \{(i, j) : i \leq j, \lambda_i + \lambda_{j+1} = i + j\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma tells us how functions on $A \in \mathcal{B}'_n$ are related to functions on the partitions and monotone triangles corresponding to A .

LEMMA 4. Let $\lambda \in P_{-1,0}(n)$; let $T \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)$ and $A = A(T)$. Then:

- (1) $\max(T) + \text{sp}(T) = i_+(A)$;
- (2) $v(\lambda) + \text{sp}(T) = \frac{1}{2}s(A)$;
- (3) $p(\lambda) = i_1^+(A) - i_1^-(A)$;
- (4) $2t(\lambda) + p(\lambda) = i_\pm(A)$;
- (5) $|\lambda| - (2t(\lambda) + p(\lambda)) = \frac{1}{2}i_0(A)$;
- (6) $x^T x_1^{-1} x_2^{-2} \cdots x_n^{-n} = x^{\delta'(B_n) - A \delta(B_n)}$.

Proof. (1) follows from Proposition 1.1 of [O].

To prove (2), we observe that $\text{sp}(T)$ is the number of -1 's in the first n rows of A (this is also contained in Proposition 1.1 of [O]). So if $s_0(A)$ is the number of -1 's in the $(n+1)$ th row of A , we see that $\text{sp}(T) = (s(A) - s_0(A))/2$. We must therefore show that $s_0(A) = 2v(\lambda)$, or equivalently that $v(\lambda)$ is the number of -1 's in the sequence $(a_{n+1,1}, \dots, a_{n+1,n})$. Now if $k \in \langle n \rangle$ and $a_{n+1,k} = -1$, we have $\hat{a}_{nk} = \hat{a}_{n,2n+1-k} = 1$; there is a pair (i, j) with $i \leq j$, $k = \lambda_{j+1} + n - j$, and $2n+1-k = \lambda_i + n - i + 1$, and we see that $\lambda_i + \lambda_{j+1} = i + j$. Conversely, if $\lambda_i + \lambda_{j+1} = i + j$, then we must have $i \leq p(\lambda)$ and $j > p(\lambda)$; therefore $\lambda_i + n - i + 1 \geq n+1$, $\lambda_{j+1} + n - j \leq n$, and $\lambda_i + n - i + 1 + \lambda_{j+1} + n - j = 2n+1$. Then if $k = \lambda_{j+1} + n - j$, we have $k \in \langle n \rangle$ and $\hat{a}_{nk} = \hat{a}_{n,2n+1-k} = 1$, so $a_{n+1,k} = -1$. This completes the proof of (2).

(3) is easy; $i_1^+(A) - i_1^-(A) = \sum_{j \geq n+1, i \leq n} a_{ij} = \sum_{j \geq n+1} \hat{a}_{nj} = \#\{j: \lambda_j + n - j + 1 \geq n+1\} = p(\lambda)$.

To prove (4), observe that

$$i_\pm(A) = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 2n} \left(\hat{a}_{nk} \sum_{l=n+2}^{2n+1} a_{lj} \right) = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 2n} \hat{a}_{nk} \hat{a}_{n,2n+1-j},$$

where the latter equality is a consequence of the rotational symmetry of A . The summand on the right is 0, unless both k and $2n+1-j$ belong to the set $\{\lambda_i + n - i + 1: i \in \langle n \rangle\}$, in which case it is 1. Now if $k = \lambda_l + n - l + 1$ and $2n+1-j = \lambda_m + n - m + 1$, then $\lambda_l + \lambda_m = l + m - 1 + k - j > l + m - 1$, so we find that

$$\begin{aligned} i_\pm(A) &= \#\{(l, m): \lambda_l + \lambda_m > l + m - 1\} \\ &= 2\#\{(l, m): l < m, \lambda_l + \lambda_m > l + m - 1\} \\ &\quad + \#\{(l, m): l = m, \lambda_l + \lambda_m > l + m - 1\} \\ &= 2t(\lambda) + p(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

For (5), we observe that the rotational symmetry of A implies that $\hat{a}_{ni} + \hat{a}_{n+1, 2n+1-i} = 1$ for all $i \in \langle 2n \rangle$. This tells us that $\hat{a}_{n+1, i}$ is 0 or 1, according as i is or is not in the set $\{n+k-\lambda_k: k \in \langle n \rangle\}$. Again using rotational symmetry, we see that $\frac{1}{2}i_0(A) = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq 2n} a_{n+1, j} \hat{a}_{nk}$. Since \hat{a}_{nk} is 1 exactly when $k = \lambda_l + n - l + 1$ for some $l \in \langle n \rangle$, and $a_{n+1, j} = \hat{a}_{n+1, j} - \hat{a}_{nj}$, we can rewrite the latter sum as $\sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_l+n-l} (\hat{a}_{n+1, j} - \hat{a}_{nj})$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_l+n-l} \hat{a}_{n+1, j} &= \sum_{l=1}^n (\lambda_l + n - l - \#\{k: n+k-\lambda_k < \lambda_l + n - l + 1\}) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^n (\lambda_l + n - l - \#\{k: \lambda_k + \lambda_l > k + l - 1\}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_l+n-l} \hat{a}_{nj} &= \sum_{l=1}^n \#\{k: \lambda_k + n - k + 1 < \lambda_l + n - l + 1\} \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^n (n - l). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}i_0(A) &= \sum_{l=1}^n (\lambda_l - \#\{k: \lambda_k + \lambda_l > k + l - 1\}) \\ &= |\lambda| - \#\{(k, l): \lambda_k + \lambda_l > k + l - 1\} \\ &= |\lambda| - (2t(\lambda) + p(\lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

(6) is left as an easy exercise for the reader.

PROOF OF THE IDENTITY

We need two more results to prove Theorem 1.

PROPOSITION 5 [O, remark following proof of Lemma 3.5]. *For $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + tx_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + x_i x_j) \\ = \sum_{\lambda \in P_{-1, 0}(n)} t^{|\lambda| - 2t(\lambda)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^2}\right)^{v(\lambda)} s_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 6 [O, Corollary 1.3]. *Let λ be a partition with length $\leq n$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + tx_i x_j^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)} t^{\max(T) + \text{sp}(T)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)^{\text{sp}(T)} x^T x_1^{-1} x_2^{-2} \dots x_n^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5 is equivalent to one of the two identities given in Theorem 3.1.2 of [S]; it is not proved in [O]. Proposition 6 is just a restatement of Theorem 2.1 of [T].

Proof of Theorem 1. Beginning with Proposition 5, replace t with $t^{1/2}$ and replace each x_i with $t^{1/2}x_i$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + tx_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + tx_i x_j) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in P_{-1, 0}(n)} t^{|\lambda| - t(\lambda)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)^{v(\lambda)} s_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n). \end{aligned}$$

Multiply both sides by $\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + tx_i x_j^{-1})$, and apply Proposition 6:

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + tx_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (1 + tx_i x_j)(1 + tx_i x_j^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in P_{-1, 0}(n) \\ T \in \mathcal{M}(\lambda + \delta_n)}} t^{|\lambda| - t(\lambda) + \max(T) + \text{sp}(T)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t}\right)^{v(\lambda) + \text{sp}(T)} x^T x_1^{-1} \dots x_n^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we employ Lemmas 2 and 4. Under the correspondence $T \mapsto A(T)$, we have $v(\lambda) + \text{sp}(T) = \frac{1}{2}s(A)$; $x^T x_1^{-1} \dots x_n^{-n} = x^{\delta'(B_n) - A\delta(B_n)}$; and

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda| - t(\lambda) + \max(T) + \text{sp}(T) &= \frac{1}{2}(i_0(A) + i_{\pm}(A) + i_1^+(A) - i_1^-(A) + 2i_+(A)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(i(A) + 2i_1^+(A) - i_1(A)) \\ &= i_1^+(A) + \frac{i_0(A) + i_2(A)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [M] I. G. Macdonald, "Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials," Clarendon, Oxford, 1979.
- [O] S. Okada, Alternating sign matrices and some deformations of Weyl's denominator formula, *J. Alg. Combin.* **2** (1993), 155–176.
- [S] T. Simpson, "Combinatorial Proofs and Generalizations of Weyl's Denominator Formula," Ph.D. thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1994.
- [T] T. Tokuyama, A generating function of strict Gelfand patterns and some formulas on characters of general linear groups, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **40** (1988), 671–685.